



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

AS

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/209,706 12/11/98 TOKAS

E IR-2588 (ET)

IM22/0602

EXAMINER

WAYNE W RUPERT
111 LORD DRIVE
P O BOX 8012
CARY NC 27512-8012

KNABLE, G

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1733

DATE MAILED:

06/02/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/209,706	Applicant(s) Tokas et al.
	Examiner Geoffrey L. Knable	Group Art Unit 1733



- Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
- This action is **FINAL**.
- Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 1 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claims

- Claim(s) 1-98 is/are pending in the application.
- Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- Claims 1-98 are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

- See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.
- The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is approved disapproved.
- The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- All Some* None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been
- received.
 - received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.
 - received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- *Certified copies not received: _____.
- Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

- Notice of References Cited, PTO-892
- Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____
- Interview Summary, PTO-413
- Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948
- Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

Art Unit: 1733

Election/Restriction

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-52, 95 and 97, drawn to a bonding method, classified in class 156, subclass 96.
- II. Claims 53-83, 93, 94, 96 and 98, drawn to a coating method, classified in class 427.
- III. Claims 84-92, drawn to a bonded article, classified in class 428 or 152 (for tire).

2. The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

3. Inventions I and III are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case, the bonded article could be made by other materially different processes such as one in which the adhesive material is provided as a premixture rather than applying the catalyst separately to one surface.

Art Unit: 1733

4. Inventions I and II are related as subcombinations disclosed as apparently usable together in a single combination. The subcombinations are distinct from each other if they are shown to be separately usable. In the instant case, invention I has separate utility such as in a bonding method where there is no formation of a reacted *coating* of the catalyst/metathesizable material. Likewise, invention II has separate utility as a coating method where there is no bonding. See MPEP § 806.05(d).

5. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Species Election

6. This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claim group I invention:

A1: metal/elastomer bonding method;

A2: tread/carcass bonding method.

B1: metathesizable material provided between substrates;

Art Unit: 1733

B2: metathesizable material provided as part of second substrate.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, at least claim 1 is generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species.

MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence

Art Unit: 1733

or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

In summary, if group I is selected, one species from A1/A2 and one from B1/B2 should be selected along with a listing of the claims readable thereon.

7. A telephone call was made to Mr. Wayne W. Rupert on May 31, 2000 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.

8. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

9. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Art Unit: 1733

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Geof Knable at telephone number (703) 308-2062. The fax phone numbers for Art Unit 1733 are (703) 305-3599 for Official After Final faxes and (703) 305-7718 for all other Official faxes.



GEOFFREY L. KNABLE
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 1700

G. Knable
June 1, 2000